



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,442	07/25/2003	Chien-Min Sung	00802-22001	3424
20551 7590 06/27/2007 THORPE NORTH & WESTERN, LLP. 8180 SOUTH 700 EAST, SUITE 350 SANDY, UT 84070			EXAMINER MARCHESCHI, MICHAEL A	
			ART UNIT 1755	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/27/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

10/627,442

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------


20070625a

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

In the pre appeal papers filed 5/24/07, applicants representative was confused as to what statute the claims (claim 1 specifically) are (is) rejected under and state that applicants believe that since the limitations of claim 8 have been incorporated into claim 1, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over WO 02/09909. This is correct, and if applicants file a brief, they are requested to use this statute to define the rejection applied.


Michael A. Marcheschi
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1755

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/627,442	Applicant(s) SUNG, CHIEN-MIN	
	Examiner Michael A. Marcheschi	Art Unit 1755	

All Participants:

(1) Michael A. Marcheschi.

(2) David W. Osborne.
Status of Application: ____

(3) ____

(4) ____

Date of Interview: 25 June 2007
Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
all
Claims discussed:
all
Prior art documents discussed:
all
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet & Attachment (PTOL-90)
Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(_____
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: informed applicants representative that since the limitations of claim 8 have been incorporated into claim 1, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over WO 02/09909, as applicants believe to be the case and which is defined in the pre appeal discussion.